



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

them to be assured that every intelligent Roman Catholic who casts his eye over our pages had the means at hand of testing whether our statements be in accordance with, or in opposition to, the Word of God. And we have repeatedly said that our columns are freely open to any Roman Catholic who can show that any assertions of ours are contradicted by the teaching of his Douay Bible.

If, as we hope, these lines are read by many Roman Catholics who are possessed of a copy of this translation of the Scriptures, we invite them to an examination of the contents of that book, which, their own Church assures them, is the Word of God Himself, dictated by the Spirit of truth for the infallible teaching of his Church.

Our readers need not be afraid that we shall perplex them in this article with wrangling as to the right translation of this or that text, or the correct interpretation of this or that disputed passage. We wish here only to take a general survey of the contents of the volume; and instead of contending about the meaning of some of the things that are in the book, to call attention to some points which undoubtedly are not in it.

1. First, then, we dare say many Roman Catholics will own it to be somewhat remarkable that from one end of the book to the other there is not the slightest mention of the Bishop of Rome. It is taught now-a-days that the Pope is appointed by God as the infallible guide of Christendom, and that he inherits this prerogative as the successor of St. Peter, who was the first Bishop of Rome. If this is true, is it not somewhat remarkable that the Bible does not make the faintest allusion to any Bishop of Rome, or even to St. Peter's having been at Rome at all? We have got a history of the labours of the principal Apostles; we have got a letter written by St. Paul to the Church of Rome; we have got several letters written by St. Paul, while himself resident in Rome: these letters contain several messages to and from the leading Christians of Rome; but among them all, not a syllable about St. Peter. And we have letters from St. Peter himself, one of them written shortly before his death; and yet he does not say a word in them about appointing a successor, nor does he mention any bishop as destined to be entitled head of the Church or to be its infallible guide after his decease.

2. Just as remarkable as the silence of Scripture with regard to St. Peter is its silence as to the existence of any infallible guide for Christ's Church. Roman Catholics believe, that in order to secure Christians from all possibility of error God has furnished them with a living infallible guide; and yet they believe also that this wonderful provision has, in great measure, failed of its intended effect. They hold that a great part of professing Christendom is overrun with deadly heresy; and all because many are unable to convince themselves of the rightfulness of the claims of that Church which makes pretensions to infallibility. Did not God foresee all the errors into which Christians would fall? Did he not know that an infallible guide would not secure them from error unless there was also provided some infallible way of discovering that infallible guide? Is it not strange, then, that the Bible, whose authority is acknowledged by all Christians, should be so silent, when all controversy might have been set at rest if there were but a single text directing all disputes to be submitted to the decision of the Bishop of Rome. On the contrary, though there are several passages where the Apostles warn their disciples that in the times after them heresies should enter the Church, they never allude to this way of detecting heresies: prayer and watchfulness on the part of Christians are the only safeguards which the Bible tells them of.

3. In the third place, we think it is very remarkable that the Bible gives us so little of the life of the Blessed Virgin Mary. We have had much discussion lately on the question of her immaculate conception; but the New Testament says not a word, not merely about her conception, but not a word about her birth—who her father and mother were; what rank of life they were; whether they were young or old at her birth: on all these points Scripture is profoundly silent. There were several holy men, several prophets destined to accomplish certain great works in the Church, who were marked out from their birth by signs and wonders for the task they had to accomplish. Thus, for instance, we are told how the birth of John the Baptist, the forerunner of our Lord, was miraculously foretold by an angel, and how it was declared that he should be filled with the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb. But there is not a trace of any similar narrative with respect to our Lord's mother. Are we not led to the inference that she was not such an important personage in the system of the Evangelists as she is in the teaching of modern Romanist divines?

It is worthy of notice, also, that the Gospels are as silent as to the death of the Blessed Virgin as they are with regard to her birth. We know that, in the Roman Catholic Church, the annual feast is celebrated of her assumption into heaven; but it is certain that wherever the Church of Rome found this story, they did not find it in the New Testament. The New Testament does not tell us how long she lived after the crucifixion, nor where she lived, nor where nor when she died, nor what became of her body. She disappears from the narrative immediately after the ascension of our Lord; in fact, all through the New Testament she is never spoken of

for her own sake, but solely where her connection with the history of our Saviour made it necessary to speak of her.

4. And this brings us to another point—the efficacy of the Virgin's intercession with God. There are numbers of Roman Catholics who feel more confidence in addressing their petitions to her than to Almighty God. God, they think, can do everything, but then, there are many things which he will not do for them. The Blessed Virgin will do anything, and there is nothing which she can't do, or, at least, which she can't get done, which comes to the same thing. It is not our business now to inquire what foundation Roman Catholics have for this belief of theirs; but it is enough here to remark that, in the New Testament, from one end to the other, there is not a single example of any one having asked the intercession of the Virgin Mary; not a single promise that prayers addressed to her will be heard; not a single command to Christians to have recourse to her intercession.

5. And the same may be said as to the intercession of any other saint. Neither by precept nor example are we encouraged in the Bible to depend on the assistance of any saint. All through the New Testament the only mediator we read of between God and man is the man Christ Jesus.

6. It is worth noticing, too, that we read nothing in the Bible as to *relics* of the saints. In those days, what would now be justly considered the most valuable relics could have been had for a little trouble, and yet we are not told of any person taking that trouble. When Stephen was martyred, we are not told of his bones being kept for relics, but his body was quietly buried; and as for other relics, such as the garments of our Lord or of his mother, the wood of his cross, or the bodies of other saints, not one of the New Testament writers ever mention such things being preserved in the Church, or being valued by Christians.

7. As to worship offered to images, we need not speak of it; for there is no mention in the New Testament history of any picture or image, or other personal representation of either our Lord or his mother, or his apostles, or any other holy person.

8. Among the epistles are some pastoral letters, addressed by St. Paul to others whom he had ordained clergymen—namely, Timothy and Titus. Now, among the directions he gives them for the discharge of their ministerial duties, he does not say a word on the subject of *hearing confessions*. Now-a-days the preparation for the confessional is the most intricate part of the studies of the young priest—the most troublesome part of his preparation for his future duties. What, then, are we to infer from the fact that St. Paul passed over the whole subject in silence? Is it not that confession to a priest was no part of the duties of Christians in the Apostolic age?

9. Is it not also very strange that there is so little about Purgatory in the Bible? We are aware that two or three texts are cited by Roman Catholic divines; but these divines say, at the same time, that the texts in question are obscure and difficult, and any candid Roman Catholic must acknowledge that, without the assistance of his infallible interpreter of Scripture, nobody would ever have discovered that they referred to Purgatory at all. Now, if Christians must pass through this fiery ordeal after this life, is it not likely that the Apostles would have plainly told their converts so; is it not likely that they would have consoled them, when suffering persecution, with the reflection that their trials in this life would shorten their torments in Purgatory; and is it not certain that they would have prayed for their departed friends, that they might be speedily delivered from this place of suffering? Now, it is certain that, from one end of the New Testament to the other, there is not one prayer for a dead person, implying that the departed was enduring any purgatorial torment.

10. Again, let us take the doctrine of the Eucharist. We print again (what we copied before in our November number) the passage in which a learned Roman Catholic describes what one who believes in transubstantiation would expect the New Testament to contain on this subject—

"In what way should we expect that our blessed Lord would give us this sublime institution? We might have thought He would have founded it with all the solemnities of Divine Legislator; that it would have been given to us as a boon for which we could never sufficiently thank Him; as a trust the responsibility of which ought to weigh gravely upon our whole lives; as the reward of our faith in Him, over which we might triumph and rejoice perpetually. It would seem as if the Holy Eucharist rather than the Resurrection would be put forward as the reason for completing the number of the apostles, as the prime evidence of the mission and love of the Son of God, and as the glorious end of His merciful coming. We might suppose that the epistles of the New Testament would contain little more than the enforcing of the doctrine of the Eucharist, or the rubrics for its consecration, or the varieties of loving devotion with which it would be our duty to surround it. Yet if we fancied this, we should have shown how little we knew our Lord's way, or had caught the true spirit of the Incarnation."—*Faber on the Blessed Sacrament*, p. 561.

Now, compare with this the *actual state of things*. Beside the historical account of the institution of the sacrament, we have one or two allusions to it in the epistles, and these by no means indicating that the writers were aware of those mysterious and wonderful miracles which Roman Catholics believe to take place every time the eucharist is celebrated.

We have given ten examples, and it would be easy to give ten more; but we must stop somewhere, and we may as well stop here.

Now, we think our readers can see the reason why it is that while Roman Catholic priests have such an aversion to the authorised version of the Scriptures, Protestants are ready cheerfully to circulate the Douay. We don't think the Douay a good translation, but we believe the Bible to be a book which no translation can spoil.

Our great assertion is, that the Church of Rome has corrupted Christianity by *adding* to it a number of humanly invented doctrines, and our proof is, that the New Testament is quite silent about these doctrines. Now, it is in vain that Roman Catholics endeavour to manufacture evidence for themselves, by putting a forced interpretation on a passage here, or by giving a mis-translation to a passage there. The whole book is such that no Roman Catholic could have written it.

Would any Roman Catholic publish a collection of lives of saints, and give no life of the Virgin Mary? If we were handed a collection of religious treatises which contained not a word about the claims of the Church of Rome, not a word about the intercession of the Virgin Mary and the saints, no mention of relics or images, no allusion to purgatorial torments, and only one or two allusions to the eucharist, and that in language to which any Protestant would readily subscribe; should we not be certain that these treatises were written either by professed Protestants or by those who were Protestants in their heart?

We ask our Roman Catholic friends to consider the argument we have laid before them. It is one which does not require any learned discussion as to the meaning of particular texts. It is easy for any one to turn over the book and see whether the Bishop of Rome is once alluded to, or to count the places where the Virgin Mary is mentioned, and so to judge whether she was prominently before the minds of the writers.

The conclusion is irresistible, that the Bible was not written by Romanists. And the priests have showed that they think so too; for there is nothing they dislike more than the circulation of the Scriptures. They do not circulate them in any translation at all except where Protestants force them to do it. We should like to see Mr. O'Hagan's 400,000 copies of the Douay matched with a return, of how many copies of the Scriptures the Church of Rome has circulated during the last seven years in Italy or Spain.

WAS CARDINAL BELLARMINE'S CELEBRATED CONTROVERSIAL WORK EVER A PROHIBITED BOOK AT ROME?

It has often been asserted, and has also, by some, been strenuously denied, that the celebrated Controversies of Cardinal Bellarmine were once in the *Index librorum prohibitorum*, and, consequently, condemned at Rome as containing false doctrine, unfit for true Catholics to read.

Is this really true? What is the authority for the statement? and how did the great champion of Romanism incur the displeasure of the Congregation of the Index?

It is an undeniable fact, that Bellarmine's Controversies was once a prohibited book, although it be now no longer so; for the Congregation of the Index enjoy a privilege denied to the Pope; they can retrace their steps, and, if they make a blunder, they can cry *peccavimus*.

But the fact is so. Bellarmine's book was in the *Index*, and the evidence of this fact is convincing.

1. It is asserted by his contemporaries, themselves also Jesuits, and deeply concerned for his fame. Four such writers, Fathers Fuligati, Bartoli, Frizon, and Poussines [or Possevinius], grave and religious men, three of whom were his contemporaries, and all Jesuits, wrote and published his life, at Rome, while many were living who could have contradicted them, and where access might at once have been had to the Congregation of the Index itself, if it had been possible to disprove the statement.

Such testimony would be sufficient, in any ordinary question, to establish historic certainty. But there is, in this case, still stronger evidence. For

2. Bellarmine has himself written a History of his Life, at the request of his friend, Father Eudemon Joannes, and of his General, Father Mutio Vitelleschi. This interesting document remained for long time in MS., but was printed by order of the Congregation of Rites, and put into the hands of the Cardinals at the time when the question of the *Beatification* of Bellarmine was under consideration.

In this work,* in which Bellarmine speaks of himself in the third person, we read (p. 21):—

"Sixtus V., in consequence of the proposition concerning the direct dominion of the Pope over the whole world, put his Controversies into the *Index* of prohibited books

* This autobiography will be found in the *Summarium positionis super Dubio de virtutibus Card. Bellarmini*, Anno, 1676, p. 112. It has been many times printed separately, at Louvain, 1763; Leipzig, 1762, &c.

until they should be corrected; but, on the death of that Pope, the Sacred Congregation of Rites ordered his name to be erased from the book of the Index."

The original words are:—

"*Sixtus enim propter propositionem de dominio Papae directo in totum orbem, posuit Controversias ejus in Indice librorum prohibitorum donec corrigerentur; sed ipso mortuo sacra rituum Congregatio jussit deleri ex libro Indicis nomen ejus.*"

One can hardly desire higher testimony than this. Bellarmine himself confesses the fact—*habetemus confidentiam*. But nevertheless we have higher testimony. For 3. The "vote," or "consultation" (we are not quite sure what the technical word is) concerning the beatification of Bellarmine, which appeared in 1677, under the name of Card. Azzolini, has these words:—

"Bellarmine himself has stated in his life that his Controversies were put in the Index by Sixtus V., and this is true [*ed è vero*]. We find by the Registers of the Congregation of the Index that they [the Controversies] were put into it, and that much interest was used with the Pope, and a petition presented to him, to have them withdrawn."

Therefore, in 1677, the Registers of the Index contained undoubted evidence of the fact that Bellarmine's Controversies were prohibited, and we have here the highest authority at Rome—the authorized publication of the Congregation of the Index that they [the Controversies] were put into it, and that much interest was used with the Pope, and a petition presented to him, to have them withdrawn.

1. One writer requires that the decree of the Congregation of the Index should be produced; he is not satisfied with the statement of the Congregation itself that such a decree was on their books in 1677, as asserted by Card. Azzolini.

But what fact in history is to be considered true if an amount of evidence greater than this be required to establish it?

2. Others allege that his Jesuit biographer, Fuligati, uses the words *di fare sospendere le sue opere*, which they tell us signify, not that the book was temporarily put into the Index, but that the publication or printing of the work was suspended; and they argue that even this was a mistake, because the first volume of the Controversies appeared in 1581, the second in 1582, and the publication of the third was delayed, not in consequence of a decree of the Congregation, but in consequence of the public business in which Bellarmine was engaged, and which compelled him to accompany Cardinal Cajetan to Paris; so that Sixtus V., who did not become Pope until 1585, could have had nothing to do with this suspension of the work.

Father Sylvestre Pietra Santa, however, who translated Fuligati into Latin, renders *sospendere* by *inhiberentur*:

"Nonnulli instare ausi sunt quo ejus opera inhiberentur, insererenturque catalogo voluminum proscriptorum, donec quae in eis forent damno corrigi possent."

We have not access to the original Italian, but, surely, these words are inconsistent with the idea that a mere delay of the publication of the volume was intended; and they agree exactly with the statement of Bellarmine himself in his autobiography, that his book was put in the Index until it should be corrected. This *donec* is fatal to the interpretation of the objectors.

3. It is objected, again, that the temporary proscription of Bellarmine's work, so popular and so much sought after, as it was, produced no opposition or remonstrance.

But the fact is not so. Cardinal Azzolini tells us expressly that much interest was made with the Pope, and that a memorial was presented to his Holiness, not by Bellarmine himself—who appears to have submitted passively—but by the Cardinals. And the death of the Pope, which happened in a few months after (whether hastened by this affair or not is another question), put an end to the whole matter. Everything was hushed up, and Bellarmine's name was erased from the Index.

4. Chronological difficulties are advanced. It is said that Bellarmine left Rome in January, 1590; that it is not pretended that his book was condemned until three or four months afterwards, that is, until about April or May; but Sixtus died in August of that year. There was, therefore, a very short time left for the examination and formal condemnation of the two volumes of the Controversies, all that were then printed; and such matters are not ordinarily conducted with such rapidity at Rome. Certainly not ordinarily; but Sixtus V. was no ordinary Pope, and managed such matters in a way of his own; as a French writer, M. L'Abbe Sisson, has said (to whom we are indebted for the materials of this paper) "Oui, à Rome, d'ordinaire on ne va pas si vite. Resterait à prouver que Sixte V. fut un Pape ordinaire."

But what are the facts? Bellarmine left Rome, not in 1590, as this argument asserts, but in 1589; for so he himself says in his autobiography (p. 19).

"In 1589 the Cardinal Cajetan having been sent as Legate into France, N. [i.e., Bellarmine], was sent with him by Pope Sixtus." (Anno 1589, cum initteretur Cardinalis Cajetanus legatus in Galliam, missus est cum N. a Sixto Pontifice.)

He arrived at Paris with Cajetan, Jan. 20, 1590, and some months after, Cajetan was reported to the Court of Rome as having given himself to the Spanish interest. Bellarmine was also suspected; and he himself tells us

that the Pope was also offended, or pretended to be offended, with what he had said in his book, on the subject of the temporal power of the See of Rome. Sixtus therefore dispensed with all inquiry or examination, and ordered, by his sovereign authority, that the Controversies should be prohibited, without regard to the protests and petitions of the doctors and cardinals.

There is no difficulty in reconciling this with the dates above given, and it is in exact accordance with the statement of the historians. For it is evident that the Controversies were in the list of prohibited books for a very short time only. The death of Sixtus V., which happened in August, 1590, was the occasion of the removal of this stigma from Bellarmine's name. This we learn from his own statement in his autobiography.

Again, Fuligati says—"Those who had raised the storm lost their power when the Pope died, and the Congregation of the Cardinals immediately ordered (without any movement on the part of Father Bellarmine), that this clause should be erased from the list of prohibited books."

Bartoli says the same thing—viz., that after the death of Sixtus, "the undeserved prohibition of the work of this learned theologian was immediately annulled."—*La non meritata proscrizione fu subito annullata.*

Poussines, better known in this country by his Latinized name of Possevinus, gives a full account of the matter:—

"After the death of Sixtus V., his successor, Urban VII., decreed that the Index ordered by his predecessor, in which the name of Bellarmine was to have appeared, should be cancelled; and thus the work of Bellarmine was cleared from all suspicion and censure, by a most honourable judgment of the Congregation of the Cardinals, charged with the examination of books whose doctrine is under suspicion."

The statements which gave offence to Pope Sixtus V. will be found in Lib. V. of the treatise *De Romano Pontifice*. It may be enough here to quote the titles of one or two of Bellarmine's chapters.

Chapter I. *That the Pope is not Lord of the whole world.*—[*Papam non esse Dominum totius mundi.*]

Chapter II. *That the Pope is not Lord of the whole Christian world.*—[*Papam non esse Dominum totius orbis Christiani.*]

Chapter III. *That the Pope has not any merely temporal jurisdiction by Divine right directly.*—[*Papam non habere ullam mere temporalem jurisdictionem directe jure Divino.*]

It is curious that at the very time when Bellarmine's great work was condemned at Rome for not giving the Pope power enough, it was condemned in France for giving him too much. At the end of 1588, when the first volume of the Controversies was brought into France, Etienne Michel, bookseller of Lyon, who was then in Paris, undertook, with another bookseller, to reprint it. But the Procureur-Général du Roi immediately interfered, and caused twenty-one sheets, which had been already wrought off, to be seized.

The history of this affair is a curious fact in the internal economy of the Roman Church. The Pope himself condemns a book for not giving him sufficient power. The Gallican Church (for at that time there was a Gallican Church) condemns the same book, because it gave the Pope too much power. And yet this Gallican Church was, for reasons of state, not as yet condemned at Rome.

Again, at the death of the Pope, the censure passed by the Congregation of the Index on the work of Bellarmine was, by the same Congregation, immediately cancelled and removed by the authority of the succeeding Pope; so that in the space of a few months, nay, perhaps weeks, a book was declared to be unfit for the perusal of the faithful and eminently fit, not for their perusal merely, but for their instruction and edification.

Either Pope Sixtus V. knew what authority had been committed to him by Divine right, or he did not. It is evident that he was not satisfied with the limitations imposed on his authority by Bellarmine—that he claimed to be Lord of the whole world, in his temporal as well as spiritual jurisdiction, by Divine right. And yet his successor Urban was content to accept his Pontifical throne, subject to the limitations admitted by Bellarmine.

What, then, are we to think of the boasted "Centre of unity," the "Judge of controversies," the "Vicar and representative of Christ on earth." Here we have two Popes at issue upon the fundamental question of the nature and extent of their own Divinely-commissioned power and jurisdiction. Do we not need here another judge of controversies—another centre of unity, to tell us where the truth lies between these two contending Pontiffs?

Let not Protestants, however, suppose that the authority of Bellarmine's work has been in any way weakened by the fact that it was once, for a time, in the list of prohibited books; and let no Roman Catholic controversialist, who may find it inconvenient to stand by any of Bellarmine's statements or arguments, think to escape from the difficulty, by alleging that the book was once in the Index; for this circumstance has greatly added to its authority. The protest of the whole body of Cardinals,

and their immediate removal of the stigma, as soon as Pope Sixtus was no more, is a higher sanction of the book, and a stronger testimony to its orthodoxy (in the Roman sense of that word), than if it had been allowed to pass, *sub silentio*, without question or censure.

IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.—GENUINE TESTIMONIES OF THE FATHERS AGAINST IT.

We made some remarks in our last number on the attempt made by Dr. Cullen in his late pastoral to persuade the people of Ireland that the new dogma of the Immaculate Conception is a doctrine as old as Christianity itself, with "the invariable testimony of Christian antiquity" to support it.

Dr. Cullen could scarcely attempt to do less; as we take it for granted that he has, like all other Roman Catholic Doctors, subscribed to the creed of Pope Pius IV.; the second article of which, as our readers know, concludes with these words, "Nec eam [Scripturam] unquam nisi iuxta unanimem consensum Patrum accipiā et interpretabor." "Nor will I ever take or interpret the Scriptures otherwise than according to the *unanimous consent* of the Fathers."

We would now solicit the attention of Dr. Cullen and our readers to a few extracts from the undisputed writings of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, upon the subject of the *nature* of the Blessed Virgin Mary, merely premising (as Cardinal Perrone, and other eminent writers have observed before us) that they may be classified under several heads, which, however, we think, may be safely reduced to two: First "Those which say that our Lord Jesus Christ, and no other, is without all sin; and secondly, those which assert that the *whole* human race is infected with original sin, and specially name the Blessed Virgin."

For examples of both classes we may refer to St. Augustine, A.D. 400, who, in his treatise against the Pelagian doctrine (that there are and would be men who have no sin whatever), distinctly says that our Blessed Lord *alone* was free from sin, and also that the Virgin was born in sin. "He *alone*, being made man, but remaining God, never had any sin; nor did He take on Him a flesh of sin, though from the flesh of sin of his mother. For what of flesh He thence took, He either, when taken, immediately purified, or purified in the act of taking it."

Again—"Mary, the mother of Christ, from whom He took flesh, was born of the carnal concupiscence of her parents; not so, however, did she conceive Christ, who was begotten, not by man, but of the Holy Ghost."

Again—"Mary, springing from Adam, died because of sin; and the flesh of our Lord, derived from Mary, died to take away sin."

We might multiply passages from St. Augustine, but to save space we shall merely add a few others in a note.*

Will any candid man, after reading the foregoing extracts, believe that St. Augustine (whatever his opinions may have been on the subject of the Blessed Virgin's *personal* purity or dignity) held the doctrine that she was spotless by *nature*, or born in any way differently from the rest of mankind?

Our next reference shall be to St. Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, in the Island of Cyprus (A.D. 370), to a spurious discourse of whom (condemned alike by the Jeanit Petavius, and by Ceillier, Tillemont, Cave, and Oudin), as we showed in our last number, p. 188) Dr. Cullen referred in his late pastoral.

St. Epiphanius speaks thus—"Whether the Holy Virgin be *dead and buried*—in that case, her death is in honour, her end is purity, and her crown in virginhood; or, whether she was slain, &c.—*for her end is not known*—we must not honour the *saints* beyond due measure. *For neither is Mary a deity, nor deriving her body from Heaven, but from man and woman,** determined, as Isaac's was, by

* St. Augustine, Opera, tom. x., p. 81 B. Benedict Ed., Paris 1890. De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione, lib. ii., c. 24, § 38. "Sed ergo illi etiam, homo factus, manens Deas, procuratus nullum habuit unquam: nec sumptis carnes peccati, quamvis de materiā carne peccati. Quod enim carnis inde suscepit, id profecto aut suscipiendo mundavit, aut suscipiendo inaudavit."

Idem, Oper. Imperf. contra Julian, lib. vi., tom. x., p. 133. A. "Maria, Mater Christi, de qua carnem sumpsit, de carnali concupiscentia parentum nata est, non autem Christiana sic ipsa conceperit, quam de virili semine sed de Spiritu Sancto procreavit."

¶ "Maria ex Adam mortua propter peccatum, et caro Domini ex Maria mortua est propter delenda peccata."—Idem. Euaratio in Psal. xxiv., tom. iv. p. 240, sermo. II.

¶ S. Aug. de Genesi ad Literam, lib. x., cap. xvii., tom. iii., p. 268. "Virginis caro etiam de peccati propagine venit, non tamen de peccati propagine concepit Primum corpus Christi, quamvis ex carne feminis assumptum est, quod illud carnis peccati propagine conceperat, tamen quia non sic in ea concepsit est quod modo peccati, nec ipsa erat caro peccati, sed simili modo carnis peccati."

¶ S. Aug. contra Julian. Pelagian. lib. V. xv., tom. x., p. 654. "Adpare illam concupiscentiam per quam Christus concepi noluit, sepe in genere humano propaginem illi, quia Maria corpus, quamvis inde venerit, tamen eam non traxit in corpus quod non inde concepsit." As, notwithstanding these unequivocal passages, St. Augustine is sometimes appealed to as if he were not unfavourable to the doctrine of the "Immaculate Conception," because he says (c. m. x., p. 144, G, De natura et gratia contra Pelagianum), "Excepta sancta Virgine Maria de qua proprius honorem Domini nullum prorsus cum de peccatis ait, haberi vult questionem," it must be observed, that he is not there speaking of *original sin*, but of *actual sin*; and though he will not enter into a discussion of that other question, yet it is clear from the above and other passages he did not regard her as exempt from even *actual human infirmity*.

* οὐτε γὰρ Θεός η Μαρία, οὐτε ἀπ' οὐρανού ἔχουσα τὸ σῶμα, ἀλλ' ἐις συλλήψεως ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικός.—Adversus Hæreses, lib. ii.: tom. 2; Epiphanius opera, tom. i., pp. 1055, '56. Colonize, 1682.